

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-44 are pending in this application. Claims 22-44 were withdrawn. Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 USC 102. Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 11-19, and 21 have been amended. Claim 5 2 has been canceled.

Claim Rejections

In rejecting the claims under 35 USC 102, the Examiner did not give the words of the claims their plain meaning as is customary to one skilled in the art. "During examination, the claims must be 10 interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow." *In re American Achademy of Science Tech Center*, 367 F3d. 1359; MPEP 2111.01 I (emphasis added). When the words of the claims are given their plain meaning, plain meaning refers to the ordinary and customary meaning given to the term by those of ordinary skill in 15 the art. MPEP 2111.01 II. "[T]he ordinary and customary meaning of the claim term is the meaning that the term would have to a person of ordinary skill in the art in question...." *Phillips v AWH Corp.* 415 F.3d 1303, 1313; MPEP 2111.01 III. Keyser et. al. illustrates a definition of "matrix" used by a person of the ordinary skill in 20 the art. See Keyser et al., pg. 2, para. 23. "**As is known**, a typical solder paste may include a plurality of solder spheres 22 suspended in a **matrix of flux material**." Keyser et al., pg. 2, para. 23 (emphasis added).

Further, the Examiner's Response to Applicant's arguments 25 state that the claims must be "given the broadest reasonable interpretation." The Examiner stated that based on a dictionary.com definition, a matrix should be defined as "something within which something else." [sic] As far as the Applicant can determine, the definition cited from dictionary.com is incomplete or misquoted. Because the definition forms the basis of the 30 Examiner's rejection but does not make sense, further clarification

is needed from the Examiner.

Although a definition at www.dictionary.com defines a matrix as a "surrounding substance within which something else...is contained....". It does not make sense to apply that definition, 5 if the solder paste is considered as the matrix because the present invention does not claim a solder paste matrix. Instead, a solder matrix is claimed.

Thus, Keyser et al. does not teach solder preform having a **solder matrix** as claimed. Further, the dependent claims contain 10 further patentable matter alone and in combination with the base claim and any intervening claims.

Therefore, Claims 1-21 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102 because all the limitations are **not** taught by the cited art. "[F]or anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, the reference must teach every 15 aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly." MPEP 706.02 IV.

Claim Amendments

Nevertheless, the claims have been amended herein to obviate the Examiner's rejections. Independent Claims 1 and 19 have been 20 amended to claim solder preform that comprises a solder matrix **of solder material**. The cited art does not disclose this. Furthermore, Claims 1, 18, and 19, now claim the microparticles **embedded in the solder material** of the solder matrix. Claim 12, 25 14, 15, 21 has been amended to claim the "solder material" which is now claimed in their respective independent claims.

Claim 2 has been canceled. Due the canceling of Claim 2, Claims 3, 4, 8, 11, and 12-17, which depended on Claim 2 have been amend to depend from Claim 1. The amendment of the claim dependencies is not intended to be made for the purposes of 30 patentability.

Therefore, in accordance with the above rationales and amendments Claims 1, 3-21 are in condition for immediate allowance. No new matter has been added.

Dated: 1/22/07

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher R. Balzan
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 40,901

AAGAARD & BALZAN, LLP
10 674 County Square Drive, Suite 105
Ventura, CA 93003
(805) 658-1945 phone
(805) 654-9984 fax